

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/991,721

Applicant(s)

MCCART ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel M Sullivan

Art Unit

1636

**All Participants:**(1) Daniel M Sullivan, Examiner.(2) Nancy Vensko, Applicant's representative.**Status of Application:** Pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 11 August 2003**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

16

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In a follow-up to the interview of 30 July 2003, the parties discussed amending the claims such that they are directed to a tumor cell comprising the vaccinia virus vector of the invention. The examiner expressed concern that such claims might read on non-statutory subject matter (i.e., a human) and might lack utility..